



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/550,590

06/01/2006

Arnold I Caplan

CWR-7781PCT/US

1634

68705

7590

05/15/2008

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL & TUMMINO, LLP
1300 EAST NINTH STREET
SUITE 1700
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

POPA, ILEANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1633

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/550,590	Applicant(s) CAPLAN ET AL.	
	Examiner ILEANA POPA	Art Unit 1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13-18, 20-26, 29, 32-39, 41, 45-48, 50, 52, 54-59, 61-67, 70, 73-80, 82, 84-89, 96, 97, 99, 101, 103-105, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114-119, 121-127, 130, 133-140, 142, 143, 145, 147-149, 151-154, 156, 158-163, 165-171, 174, 177-184, 186-191 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-4,6,8,9,11,13-18,20-26,29,32-39,41,45-48,50,52,54-59,61-67,70,73-80,82,84-89,96,97,99,101,103-105,107,109,110,112,114-119,121-127,130,133-140,142,143,145,147-149,151-154,156,158-163,165-171,174,177-184 and 186-191.

Art Unit: 1633

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 5, 7, 10, 12, 19, 27, 28, 30, 31, 40, 42-44, 49, 51, 53, 60, 68, 69, 71, 72, 81, 83, 90-95, 98, 100, 102, 106, 111, 113, 120, 128, 129, 131, 132, 141, 144, 146, 150, 152, 155, 157, 164, 172, 173, 175, 176, 185, and 187 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13-18, 20-26, 29, 32-39, 41, 45-48, 50, 52, 54-59, 61-67, 70, 73-80, 82, 84-89, 96, 97, 99, 101, 103-105, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114-119, 121-127, 130, 133-140, 142, 143, 145, 147-149, 151-154, 156, 158-163, 165-171, 174, 177-184, 186-191 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13-18, 20-26, 29, 32-39, 41, 45-48, 50, 52, 54-59, 61-67, 70, 73-80, 82, 84-89, 190, and 191, drawn to a cell delivery composition.

Group II, claim(s) 96, 97, 99, 101, 103-105, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114-119, 121-127, 130, 133-140, 142, 143, 145, 147-149, 151-154, 156, 158-163, 165-171, 174, 177-184, 186-189, drawn to a tissue engineering composition.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

A) The invention has no special technical feature that defined the contribution over the prior art, **or**

B) Unity of invention between different categories of inventions will only be found to exist if specific combinations of inventions are present. Those combinations include:

- 1) A product and a special process of manufacture of said product.
- 2) A product and a process of use of said product.
- 3) A product, a special process of manufacture of said product, and a process of use of said product.
- 4) A process and an apparatus specially designed to carry out said process.
- 5) A product, a special process of manufacture of said product, and an apparatus specially designed to carry out said process.

The allowed combinations do not include multiple products, multiple methods of using said products, and methods of making multiple products as claimed in the instant application, see MPEP § 1850. It is noted that the instant claims are drawn to multiple products.

Applicant's claims encompass multiple inventions and do not have a special technical feature which link the inventions one to the other, and lack unity of invention.

3. Should the invention of Group I be elected for prosecution, species election is required as follows:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Art Unit: 1633

- A. Targeting moiety interacts with a carbohydrate (claims 14 and 54), targeting moiety comprises a homing peptide (claims 20 and 61), targeting moiety comprises an antibody (claims 26 and 67), targeting moiety comprises a fusion protein (claims 33 and 73), targeting moiety comprises a receptor or ligand (claims 35 and 76), targeting moiety comprises an aptamer (claims 37 and 78), targeting moiety is a peptidomimetic (claims 38 and 79).

Should the species of homing peptide be elected for prosecution, Applicant is required to elect a single species of homing peptide from the peptides recited in claims 21-24 and 62-65.

Should the species of fusion protein be elected for prosecution, Applicant is required to elect between a fusion protein comprising an Fc fragment (claims 33 and 74) and a fusion protein comprising a homing peptide (claims 34 and 75).

- B. Delivery into blood (claim 84), delivery via injection into the target tissue (claim 85), delivery via surgical implantation (claim 86), delivery via subcutaneous injection (claim 87), delivery via intra-peritoneal injection (claim 88), and delivery via intra-synovial injection (claim 89).

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species from each Group A and B for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 190 are generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are

Art Unit: 1633

added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

In addition to the above:

Claims 2, 3, 11, 39, 41, 45, 46, 52, 80, and 82 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species:

- A. Distinct species of progenitor cells (claims 2, 3, 45, and 46);
- B. Distinct species of markers (claims 11 and 52);
- C. Distinct species of target tissues (claims 39 and 80);
- D. Distinct species of bioactive factors (claims 41 and 82).

The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species from each Group A-D for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are

added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant is advised that the elected species of progenitor cell, markers, target tissue, bioactive factor, and targeting moiety must be consistent with each other.

4. Should the invention of Group II be elected for prosecution, species election is required as follows:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

- Targeting moiety interacts with a carbohydrate (claims 115 and 158),
targeting moiety comprises a homing peptide (claims 121 and 165),
targeting moiety comprises an antibody (claims 130 and 171), targeting

moiety comprises a fusion protein (claims 133 and 177), targeting moiety comprises a receptor or ligand (claims 136 and 180), targeting moiety comprises an aptamer (claims 138 and 182), targeting moiety is a peptidomimetic (claims 139 and 183).

Should the species of homing peptide be elected for prosecution, Applicant is required to elect a single species of homing peptide from the peptides recited in claims 122-125 and 166-169.

Should the species of fusion protein be elected for prosecution, Applicant is required to elect between a fusion protein comprising an Fc fragment (claims 134 and 178) and a fusion protein comprising a homing peptide (claims 135 and 179).

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 96 is generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would

Art Unit: 1633

not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

In addition to the above:

Claims 97, 99, 101, 103, 104, 112, 140, 143, 145, 147, 148, 156, 184, and 186 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species:

- A. Distinct species of bioresorbable materials (claims 97, 99, 143, and 145);
- B. Distinct species of progenitor cells (claims 103, 104, 147, and 148);
- C. Distinct species of markers (claims 112 and 156);
- D. Distinct species of target tissues (claims 140 and 184);
- E. Distinct species of bioactive factors (claims 101 and 186).

The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species from each Group A-E for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would

not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species**, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant is advised that the elected species of progenitor cell, markers, target tissue, bioactive factor, and targeting moiety must be consistent with each other.

5. Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of one progenitor cell type (i.e., the subcombination) as claimed because the combination can be used with any progenitor cell. The progenitor cell can be used in conjunction different scaffolds, i.e., in other combinations.

The Examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such

Art Unit: 1633

claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

6. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILEANA POPA whose telephone number is (571)272-5546. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am-5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on 571-272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1633

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ileana Popa, PhD
/Ileana Popa/
Art Unit 1633